



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

70. *GIŠ MÁ KI-ÁG SIS-UNU-KI* = " " *Ú-ri*
 71. " " " " *DÚG-GAR-KI* = " "
 72. " " " " *KÊŠ-KI* = " " *Ki-e-ši*
 VI.1. " " " " *KIŠ-KI* = " " *Ki-ši*

Meissner, *SAI*, 6168, 8350, has exploited some of these results as he did one variant of Col. VI.2 in *SAI*, 4035.

With respect to the sixth column it must be noted that A crowds 92 entries into this column, while B has only 60 lines. No two copies arranged their entries alike in columns. But they maintained the same order of entries. The nearest conclusion is that the whole text registered in all 72+72+72+72+72+92 entries, or 452. Many duplicates show the beginnings or ends of lines alongside those portions sufficiently preserved to be useful. Had the lengths of columns always been the same, these traces might have helped to fix the place of more fragments. But, to take one example only, Col. II.5 is on the same level as Col. I.5 on A, while Col. II.49 is on the same level as Col. I.45 on B.

Delitzsch gave a complete column down to line 38 (entry 44) and then from line 50 (entry 55) to line 75 (entry 92). We can complete from duplicates all the ideograms, but can give no Semitic equivalents.

For the whole text the duplicates give 83 new entries and complete 28 of those already partly known, thus adding about one-fifth. Some day I may have the opportunity to publish the fragments in full. It does not seem worth while here to record mere variants nor set down unexplained ideograms.

C. H. W. JOHNS

ST. CATHERINE'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

STUDIES IN HEBREW ROOTS AND THEIR ETYMOLOGY

I

בִּשֶׁק, שֶׁקַּק, שֹׁרֶק

The three roots בִּשֶׁק, שֶׁקַּק, and שֹׁרֶק were hardly distinguished in post-biblical and talmudic times when confusion of roots was the outstanding feature in biblical exegesis.¹ Menaḥem ben Saruk, the champion of the biliteral (and also uniliteral) theory of Hebrew roots, throws them all together under שֶׁק;² and even Ḥayyuj, the iconoclast of the biliteral fad, still confuses words whose origin is שֹׁרֶק with those whose origin is שֶׁקַּק.³ Ibn

¹ On violations in the Septuagint cf. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 200. Confusion of roots is also rampant in the minor Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, as pointed out in my "Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila," *JQR* (New Series), IV, 578 ff. As to Talmud and Midrash cf. Bacher, *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik*, p. 6; see also Gesenius, *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*, pp. 69 ff.

² מחברת מנחם, ed. Filipowski, p. 179.

³ *The Weak and Geminative Verbs in Hebrew*, ed. Jastrow, p. 268 of the Arabic text. Even רַחֲשֶׁק Job 31:27 is included in this group!

Ḡanaḥ is the first to distinguish the three,¹ and he is followed by Kimḥi,² who in turn is followed by all modern lexicographers.³ But, while this root classification was effected, the etymology and consequently the meaning of these words remained obscure. Thus שׁוּק was persistently compared with Arab. ساق "drive, impel, urge," from which is derived ساق = שׁוּק = "leg,"⁴ until Barth⁵ and Brockelmann⁶ suggested شاق "long, desire," which covers completely the Hebr. אִתְּשׁוּקָה.⁷ As to שׁוּק, already Ibn Ḡanaḥ associated it with Arab. شَق in the sense of "walking to and from, perambulating,"⁸ and this has been adopted by all lexicographers, both old and new, who in addition compare שׁוּק = ساق = "leg," hence "walking."⁹ Finally, מִשְׁק is either left without an etymology¹⁰ or else made to correspond to מִשְׁק = مسك in the sense "to possess."¹¹

The purpose of this article is to subject these roots to a new investigation through an examination of the passages in which they occur. Starting with Prov. 28:15, אִרִי נָהִים וְרֵב שׁוּקָק, we see at a glance that שׁוּקָק, being parallel to נָהִים, must signify something akin to it, something in the nature of emitting a sound, and not, as is generally assumed, "walking to and from." Now, if we consult the Arabic lexicon, we find that شَق, the very same root which Ibn Ḡanaḥ adduces *s.v.*, besides many other significations, also has the meaning "to spread in the sky (of lightning),"¹² hence to

¹ *Kitāb al-Uzūl*, ed. Neubauer, *s.vv.*

² ספר השרשים, ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht, *s.vv.*

³ Cf., e.g., Gesenius-Buhl, Brown-Driver-Briggs, König, etc.

⁴ Notably Brown-Driver-Briggs and Gesenius-Buhl¹⁵, *s.v.*

⁵ *Etymologische Studien*, p. 46.

⁶ *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*, I, 167.

⁷ We must not be too scrupulous with reference to the irregular equation ש = שׁ, especially in the face of such old and well-established words as שָׁמֶשׁ = שֶׁמֶשׁ = שֶׁשׁ.

especially in the face of such old and well-established words as שָׁמֶשׁ = שֶׁמֶשׁ = שֶׁשׁ, etc. Barth has proved (*loc. cit.*) that such discrepancies from the accepted rule will arise in the case of words with sibilants (especially in triliteral roots with two sibilants); similarly Vollers (*ZFA*, IX, 197, 209) and Jahuda (*JQR*, XV, 708). I am convinced that the current equations of the sibilants in the Semitic languages require recasting, and, unless this is done, biblical exegesis will not make much headway.

⁸ In his *Kitāb al-Mustalḥik* (*Opusculum*, ed. Derenbourg, pp. 234 ff.) Ibn Ḡanaḥ defends the geminate nature of שׁוּק, בעיר ישׁוּק, etc., against the detractors of Ḥayyuj, adding to these also שׁוּקָק בְּרַחוּבָה and giving them all the meaning "crush, oppress." However, in his *Kitāb al-Uzūl* (ed. Neubauer, cols. 742 f.) he suggests also another meaning, "walking to the right and to the left," akin to the Arabic اشتق الفرس في عدوه.

⁹ This ambiguity was common to Ibn Ezra and Kimḥi, and it still prevails in our commentaries and lexica.

¹⁰ As in most modern lexica.

¹¹ Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, *s.v.* מִשְׁק.

¹² Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. 1576, col. 2: "it [the lightning] extended high, into the midst of the sky, without going to the right and left."

thunder, or at any rate to emit some kind of a noise. Furthermore, **שָׁפַף** **הַכֶּלֶם** = "he uttered, or pronounced, speech in the best manner,"¹ and **שָׁפַף** = "he neighed (of a stallion) or uttered a cry (of a sparrow)."² There is also the testimony of a manuscript supposed to be the *Jami* of El-Karmanee that the primary meaning of **שָׁפַף** is "loudness of voice," or the "being loud in voice."³ Applying this meaning to the passage in question, we at once get an excellent parallelism: "As a roaring lion and a howling bear is a wicked ruler over a poor people." The same meaning fits very well Nah. 2:5, **בַּחוֹצוֹת יִתְהוֹלְלוּ הָרֶכֶב יִתְקַשְׁקְשְׁקוּ בְּרֹחוֹבוֹת**: "The chariots rage in the streets, they reverberate (like thunders) in the broad ways," giving an unexpected vividness to the picture.⁴ It is in the nature of the poet who portrays an action in two immediate but independent clauses either to keep up the same tone or else to ascend in the second phrase, so as to complete the thought and round out the action.⁵ Such, e.g., is the very next picture in the same sentence where the chariots are compared first with torches and then with lightnings. But such an upward graduation is lacking in our current translations, "rage" being more intense than "run to and from," while "reverberate" restores the proper balance. Similarly Isa. 33:4, **בְּמִשְׁקַח גִּבִּים תִּשְׁקַח בּוֹ**, should be rendered "like the buzzing of the locusts will it buzz in their midst"⁶ (*scil.* in the midst of the nations), presaging confusion and distress, in keeping with the preceding sentence. Finally, Joel 2:9, **בְּעִיר יִשְׁקֹוּ**, = "they shall shout in the city"; the following **בַּחוֹמָה יִרְצֹוּ**, it is evident, precludes the current rendering "run to and from."⁷

That this interpretation has not only an etymological, but also a traditional, basis may be seen from the fact that the Targum translates in a like manner in at least two of the four passages;⁸ that Rashi, the coryphaeus of

¹ Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. 1576, col. 3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 1577, col. 2.

³ *Ibid.* It is not impossible that the common meaning of this root, "break," "split," is secondary and derived from the primary, "utter a noise," since a noise is produced in splitting or breaking. This, indeed, is evident in such expressions as **وانشق القمر** and **انشقت السماء** Koran 54:1 and *ibid.*, 84:1.

⁴ Notice the appropriateness of an echo in broad ways.

⁵ Cf. Rothstein, *Grundzüge des hebräischen Rhythmus*, pp. 51 ff.

⁶ Noise in a lesser degree, just as **נָהַם** is used in various degrees: of the raging of the sea, of the roaring of the lion, and of the groaning of the afflicted (cf. *lexica*, s.v.).

⁷ Cf. Rothstein, *loc. cit.*

⁸ To Prov.: **קל נקוש זניהון משתמע**, and to Nah.: **אריא נהם ודובא מצריח**, and to Jer.: **ברחובי נשק**. In the latter case he certainly confused it with **נשק** "weapon," as may be seen from his rendering in Isa.: **כמא דאזן בזירקתא** and Joel: **בקרחת מזדינין**; nevertheless it is significant that he felt obliged to introduce the element of voice.

Jewish exegetes, does so in all the four passages;¹ and, finally, that Ibn Ganah mentions the possibility of **לִב שׁוֹקֵק** being something akin to **אָרִי נָהֵם**.²

I am inclined to class here also Gen. 15:2, **וּבֶן־מִשְׁק בֵּיתִי**, and make it correspond to **מִשְׁק גִּבִּים**, treated above. This word, pointed as a segholate,³ is naturally derived from an imaginary **מִשְׁק**, for which there is no analogy in the Semitic languages.⁴ But already Ibn Ezra felt the necessity of classing it under the geminate verbs,⁵ without, it is true, finding a satisfactory meaning. Now **שָׁף**, or rather **שִׁשְׁשָׁף**, "utter, converse," gives rise in Arabic to an expression **ذُو شَقْشَقَةٍ**, "one speaking fluently," "a spokesman,"⁶ analogous to the Aram. **דברנא** or **מדברנא**, "spokesman," event, "representative, leader."⁷ We might therefore point **מִשְׁק**⁸ and render "the spokesman (or leader) of my house."

Different from these is the expression **נִפְשׁ שׁוֹקֵקָה** which occurs in Isa. 29:8 and Ps. 107:9. Its meaning is so evident from the context (**נִפְשׁ רִצְבָה**) that all commentators and lexicographers agree in translating it by "longing." But its etymology has always been a matter of speculation. However, admitting, as we must, that it is akin to **תְּשׁוּקָה** in meaning, it likewise should be derived from **שׁוֹק = שָׁף** "long, desire,"⁹ and not, as is generally the case, from **שׁוֹק = שָׁף**.⁹ Accordingly, **שׁוֹקֵק** is a participle of the type **Pôl'el** and, like **בִּזְיָחַת** and, **קוֹיִם**, **רוֹיִם**, represents the **Pf'el** and is intensive.¹⁰ This construction is very appropriate: the longing

¹ To Prov.: **נְהִימָה לְאָרִי וְשָׁקִיקָה לְדוֹב שְׁנִיחָה לְשׁוֹן צַעֲקָה**; to Nah. and Joel: **ל' הַשְׁמַעְתָּ קוֹל נָהֵם**; to Isa.: **ל' נָהֵם**.

² *Kitāb al-Uzūl*, ed. Neubauer, col. 743: **وَرَبِمَا كَانَ مَعْنَى آخِرِ جَانِئًا لِقَوْلِهِ: أَرِي نَوَاهٍ**.

³ So, already, the Septuagint whose **μασκε**=**מִשְׁק**. Contrast, however, Aquila's **ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πορίζοντος οἰκίαν μου**, implying **מִשְׁקָה-מִשְׁק**. The other two translators (Symmachus: **ὁ δὲ συγγενὴς τοῦ οἴκου μου**, and Theodotion: **ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας μου**) are noncommittal.

⁴ The etymon **مشق**, which is treated further, below, apparently has nothing in common with this word.

⁵ Cf. his commentary *ad loc.*: **והוא מפעלי הכפל מגזרת שוקק בר**.

⁶ Lane's *Lexicon*, p. 1579, col. 1.

⁷ Cf. especially b. Sanh. 14a and Ket. 17a: **מדברנא דאומתיה**, "leader of his people." That **דבר** "lead" and **דבר** "speak" are cognates with a derivative meaning has been demonstrated by Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, p. 313) and others.

⁸ As pointed out above (n. 3), Aquila's **πορίζων** points to the pronunciation with pathah. Perhaps the same reading underlies the Targum: **וּבֶר פִּרְנָסָא**, followed by Rashi.

⁹ Probably due to its similarity with **לִב שׁוֹקֵק**.

¹⁰ Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Grammar*²⁸, Eng. transl., § 72m, pp. 197 f.

of the thirsty being more intense than that of the hungry, an intensive verb is employed.

The third root of the series, **משק**, underlies Zeph. 2:9, **מִמֶּשֶׁק הָרוּל** וּמִכְרֵה-מִלֵּחַ, as generally recognized. But what is the meaning of **מִמֶּשֶׁק**? The Jewish commentators are too vague and ambiguous to deserve credence.¹ The ancient versions render no help.² Modern exegetes translate "possession, place of possession," without adducing a cognate etymon or satisfying the context.³ Graetz's emendation to **קמִיש**⁴ upsets the parallelism with **מְכִרָה**. Schwally makes it synonymous with Arab. **مَنْبِت**, "place of growth,"⁵ which again is only a guess. I would suggest Arab. **مشق**, which, as a term of agriculture, is explained by Dozy as follows: "remuer légèrement la terre autour des racines des plantes avec un **قدوم**, c.-à-d., avec un instrument qui est pioche d'un côté et hache de l'autre, *piocher légèrement*."⁶ **מִמֶּשֶׁק** is thus *nom. loc.* of **משק**, "cut, dig," and signifies "ditch," an appropriate parallel to **מְכִרָה** "pit." Translate, therefore, "ditches of chickpeas and pits of salt."⁷

JOSEPH REIDER

DROPSIE COLLEGE

¹ Ibn Ezra, like all modern exegetes, associates it with **ובן משק ביתי**; Rashi renders **יש מפרשים** like **משק גבים**; Kimḥi likewise in his *Lexicon* under **פירושו לפי מקומו מוצא החרולים כלומר שיצמחו** שם מפני החרבן.

² **Δαμασκος** of the Septuagint shows that it was no longer understood in those days and that the translators simply tried to help themselves.

³ The equation **משך = مسك = משק** "possess," which was invented primarily as an explanation of **ובן משק ביתי**, while possible in itself, is not probable in our case, since it does not furnish smoother sense and, moreover, fails to satisfy the parallel in the context.

⁴ *Emendationes*, ed. Bacher, *ad loc.*

⁵ *ZA W*, X (1890), 188 f.

⁶ *Supplément aux Dictionnaires arabes*, II, 594.

⁷ Something like this underlies the Targum (and the Peshitta) **משמט מלוחין** וּמַחְפּוּרִין דְּמִלְחָה being a parallel to **ובחפורין** and signifying "hiding-place, lurking hole, or recess" (Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Targumim*, s.v. **מלוחא**).